REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 25, 27, and 29. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 17-30 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Examiner Objections – Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because the element of "modulating the determined identification code onto a signal to generate an access request signal from which transmission path information may be derived" is not shown in the drawings. In response, the Applicant respectfully disagrees. Figure 7 illustrates a modulator 26 for performing the modulation function. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 17-30 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In response, the Applicant has amended claims 17, 22, 27, and 29 to provide proper antecedent basis. Therefore, the withdrawal of the rejection and the allowance of claims 17-30 is respectfully requested.

4.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 17-30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al. (US 2003/002634, hereinafter Li). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. The Applicant has further amended independent claim 17, 22, 27, and 29 to more clearly and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant considers as his invention.

It is important to remember that anticipation requires that the disclosure of a single piece of prior art reveals <u>every</u> element, or limitation, of a claimed invention. Furthermore, the limitation that must be met by an anticipatory reference are those set forth in each statement of function in a claims limitation, and such a limitation cannot be met by an element in a reference that performs a different function, even though it may be part of a device embodying the same general overall concept. Li fails to anticipate each and every limitation of claim 17. Therefore, claim 17 is not anticipated.

Claim 17 recites:

17.   A method of requesting access to a node of a wireless communications network, the method, comprising the steps of:
a) determining information about a transmission path within the network;
b) <u>determining an identification code to differentially identify a requesting network component from other network components based on the determined transmission path information</u>, wherein previously an association between identification codes and transmission path information has been established; and
c) modulating, <u>by the requesting network component, the determined identification code</u> onto a signal <u>to generate an access request signal</u> from which transmission path information may be derived. (emphasis added)

The Applicant's invention is directed to a method of requesting access to a node of a wireless network is characterized. An identification code is determined which differentially identifies the requesting network component from other network components. The present invention utilizes established associations between identification codes and transmission path information results to improved signalling between the requesting network component and the access node of the wireless communications network.

The Examiner stated that Li discloses the steps of: determining an identification code to differentially identify a requesting network component from other network components based on the determined transmission path information, wherein previously an association between identification codes and transmission path information has been established; and modulating, by the requesting network component, the determined identification code onto a signal to generate an access request signal from which transmission path information may be derived. The Applicant respectfully disagrees

with this characterization. Li discloses the use of open-loop power-control symbols (OLPCSs) and closed-loop power control symbols (CLPCSs) to derive a power control command (see paragraph 55 of Li). Li does not use these symbols to identify the requesting network component based on the determined transmission path information. Rather, Li discloses computing an OLPCS and receiving a CPCPS from the base station to derive a composite power control command. Specifically, these parameters are utilized for determining a power level for sending the power control command to the base station (see paragraph 63 of Li).

Furthermore, Li does not disclose modulating, by the requesting network component, the determined identification code onto a signal to generate an access request signal from which transmission path information may be derived. Li merely discloses using parameters (i.e., OLPCS and CLPCS) to determine a power level to send a power command to the base station. Li does not use the determined identification code to generate an access request signal. In contrast, Li sends a power command to the base station at a determined power level. This command does not include information on the transmission path.

Accordingly, Li is missing several elements. Specifically, Li is missing the steps: determining an identification code to differentially identify a requesting network component from other network components based on the determined transmission path information, wherein previously an association between identification codes and transmission path information has been established; and modulating, by the requesting network component, the determined identification code onto a signal to generate an access request signal from which transmission path information may be derived. Thus, Li does not anticipate claim 17. Independent claims 22, 27, and 29 contain limitations analogous to claim 17 and also are not anticipated by Li. Claims 18-21 and 26 depend from claim 17 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 17. Claims 23-25 depend from claim 22 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 22. Claim 28 depends from claim 27 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 27. Claim 30 depends from claim 29 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel

elements of claim 29. Therefore, the allowance of claims 17-30 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 17-30.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger S. Burleigh
Registration No. 40,542

Date: October 6, 2008

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-5799
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com